

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been amended. Claim 39 has been cancelled. Claims 1-38 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 112

Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 39 has been cancelled. Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 102

Claims 1-8, 13-15, 19, 21 and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pirdy et al. (U.S. 6,151,218) (hereinafter “Pirdy”).

Pirdy discloses a physical security system for a portable computer. A docking unit 100 and portable computer 10 have a system for securing the computer to the unit. The docking unit has two latching elements 132, 134 in the docking bay 110. Latching elements 132, 134 allow the portable computer 10 to be latched on to the docking unit. Pirdy, 4:49-4:53 and Figure 4.

In Pirdy, lowering the portable computer 10 onto the docking bay causes the bottom wall of the portable computer, surrounding the right and left latching holes 22, 24 to engage latch release buttons 168, 170. This causes the latching elements 132, 134 to extend upward and toward the rear of the docking unit 100. The latching elements 132, 134 thus extend into the right and left latching holes 22, 24 of the portable computer 10 to securely hold the rear of the portable computer 10 against the docking unit 100 in the docking bay 110. This in combination with the engagement of the tabs 112, 114 at the front of the portable computer, retain the portable computer 10 securely in the docking bay 110. Pirdy, 4:54-4:67 and Figure 4

Figure 6 of Pirdy shows a schematic plan view of the latch control system that operates the latching elements, which is located in the electronic section 127 of the docking unit 100. The right and left latch release buttons 136, 138 each comprise elongate, metal rods 302, 304. The body portion of the buttons 136, 138 each have camming surfaces 306, 308. When each of the latch release buttons 136, 138 is depressed, the camming surfaces 306 and 308 engage arm

portions 310, 312 of the latching elements 132, 134. This causes the latching elements 132, 134 to be retracted, and thereby release the computer 10 from the docking unit 100. Pirdy, 5:18-5:30 and Figure 6.

In order to provide security using the system of Pirdy, the depression of the latch release buttons 136, 138 is prevented in software. Specifically, each of the metal arms 302, 304 extends to a spring loaded locking element 314. Specifically, spring 316 biases the locking element 314 in the direction of arrow 318 against wall 320. Pirdy, 5:31-5:35.

Claims 1-8

Claim 1 recites: "...wherein the locking member is inserted into the locking hole and rotates based on locking member rotation information." In contrast to claim 1, the latching elements 132, 134 of Pirdy, that correspond to the locking member recited in claim 1, do not rotate. In Pirdy, a locking element 314 is prevented from movement by an arm 330 of a solenoid 332, but this locking element 314 only prevents the latch release buttons 136, 138 from being operated. The latching elements 132, 134 do not rotate as is recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 13-15

Claim 13 recites: "...a rotary motor connected to the locking member to rotate the locking member..." Similar to the argument made above regarding claim 1, the locking member of claim 13 does not correspond to the locking element 314 of Pirdy. The latching elements 132, 134 of Pirdy correspond to the locking member recited in claim 13, and latching elements 132, 134 do not rotate. Further, the rotary motor of claim 13 rotates the locking member in order to release the portable terminal, whereas the solenoid 332 prevents the locking element 314 from rotating. The locking element does not release the latching elements 132, 134 though, pressure by a user on the latch release buttons 136, 138 releases the latching elements 132, 134.

Claims 14 and 15 depend on claim 13 and are therefore believed to allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

Claims 19, 21 and 29-34

Claim 19 recites: "...a locking unit having at least one locking member to rotate to lock and unlock together the portable terminal device and the cradle device based upon at least locking member rotation information..." Similar to the arguments made above regarding independent claims 1 and 13, in contrast to claim 19, the latching elements 132, 134 of Pirdy, that correspond to the at least one locking member recited in claim 19, do not rotate. In Pirdy, a locking element 314 is prevented from movement by an arm 330 of a solenoid 332, but this locking element 314 only prevents the latch release buttons 136, 138 from being operated. The latching elements 132, 134 do not rotate to lock and unlock as is recited in claim 19.

Claims 21 and 29-34 depend on claim 19 and are therefore believed to allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 103

Claims 12, 20 and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirdy in view of Davis (U.S. 6,564,600) (hereinafter "Davis").

Claims 12, 20 and 35-38 depend on one of claims 1 and 19, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Further, claims 12, 20 and 35-38 patentably distinguish over Pirdy and Davis, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 12 recites that the cradle further comprises a polarity switching terminal connected to the rotary motor, for switching polarities of the electric power applied to the rotary motor, the polarity switching terminal being controlled through the cradle control section, and the polarity switching terminal switches the polarities such that the rotary motor rotates in a given direction when a recognition signal for recognizing the connection of the first and second connection terminals is inputted through the cradle control section, and the rotary motor rotates in a direction opposite to the given direction when a recognition signal for recognizing the inputting of the password is inputted.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 USC 103

Claims 38 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirdy in view of Myers (U.S. 5,959,287) (hereinafter "Myers").

Claim 38 depends on claim 19 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Further, claim 38 patentably distinguishes over Pirdy and Myers, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 38 recites that the at least one locking member is a "1" shape and the locking hole is a bore shape.

Claim 39 has been cancelled.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation that claims 9-11, 16-18 and 22-28 have been found to contain allowable subject matter. However, in view of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-11, 16-18 and 22-28 are allowable in their present form.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec 5, 2005

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501